



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09.757,378	01/09/2001	James Brady	98-C-037C1	6527

7590 12 03 2001

Lisa K. Jorgenson
M/S 2346
1310 Electronics Dr.
Carrollton, TX 75006

EXAMINER

LEE, BENNY T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2817

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



U. S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED APPLICANT | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

EXAMINER	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
7	

DATE MAILED:

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

This application has been examined

Responsive to communication filed on 19 Oct 200 This action is made final.

Indicated statutory period for response to this action is set to expire Three (3) month(s), 60 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133.

1. THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
2. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449
3. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474
4. Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-643.
5. Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152
6.

II. SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. Claims 1-6, 8 - 19 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. Claims 7, 20 have been cancelled.

3. Claims _____ are allowed.

4. Claims 1-6, 8-10, 11-16, 17-19 are rejected.

5. Claims _____ are objected to.

6. Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes until such time as allowable subject matter is indicated.

8. Allowable subject matter having been indicated, formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. These drawings are: acceptable;
 not acceptable (see explanation).

10. The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been approved by the examiner, disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been approved, disapproved (see explanation). However, the Patent and Trademark Office no longer makes drawing changes. It is now applicant's responsibility to ensure that the drawings are corrected. Corrections MUST be effected in accordance with the instructions set forth on the attached letter "INFORMATION ON HOW TO EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES", PTO-1474.

12. Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received, not been received
 been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.

13. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. Other _____

Art Unit: 2817

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Page 5, in the brief description of figs. 1 and 6B, should these drawing figure be considered -- prior art --?; line 12, note that reference to "line A-A" is not consistent with line 3B-3B in figure 3A; line 13, "4A-4C" should be rewritten as -- 4A, 4B, 4C --; line 15, "5A-5C" should be rewritten as -- 5A, 5B, 5C --; line 20, note that "6B-6D" should be rewritten as --6B, 6C, 6D --. Page 7, line 7, note that "delta" needs to be strictly defined. Note that "TO OTHER ~~C~~CIRCUITRY" appearing in Fig. 4C needs to be described in the specification.

The drawings are objected to because of the following: In figs. 1, 3B, 5A, 5B, 6B, 6C, 6D, note that for the cross-sectional views therein, a proper cross-hatching for an insulating material needs to be provided. In Figs. 1, 6B, should these figures be labeled as -- PRIOR ART --?; In fig. 4c, reference label -- 120 -- needs to be provided. Correction is required.

Claims 1-6, 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, note that there appears to be an improper double inclusion of "a source" (see lines 2 and 5).

The following claim has been found objectionable for reasons set forth below:

In claim 19, note that -- ^{Spec}receptive -- should precede "length" for a proper characterization.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2817

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 8, 9; 11, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Adachi.

Adachi discloses an electrical conductor arrangement comprising first and second conductive traces (14a, 14b) disposed for interconnection with a source via terminals (13a, 13b) and a destination via terminals (13c, 13d). By virtue of the like configuration to the claimed invention, the Adachi arrangement inherently functions to reduce the capacitance (i.e. compared to an arrangement having a single conductive trace) and thus inherently functions to increases the propagation speed along the conductive traces.

Claims 1-4, 8, 9; 11-15; 17, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Shimizu et al.

Shimizu et al discloses in fig. 1, first, second, and third conductors (13₁, 13₂, 13₃) electrically connected to a source (11) and electrically connected to a destination (12). Note that by virtue of the capacitance existing between the conductive traces, there inherently is an electrical connection between the conductors. Moreover, given the like configuration between the claimed invention and Shimizu et al, inherently the capacitance is reduced and propagation speed increased (see preceding rejection for explanation).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2817

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 10, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adachi.

Claims 10, 16, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu et al.

In the two preceding rejections, note that neither reference discloses the length of the conductive traces. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have optimized the length of the conductive traces (e.g. > 1000 microns) dependent on the amount of “real estate” (e.g. on an integrated circuit) available. Such a modification would have obviously optimized the line lengths given the available “real estate”.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Tan et al pertains to a three conductor arrangement.

Art Unit: 2817

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Benny Lee at telephone number (703) 308-4902.

Benny Lee

Lee/ds

BENNY T. LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
11/29/01 ART UNIT 2817